

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/811,652	HILL, DANIEL J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Darren W. Ark	3643

All Participants:

(1) Darren W. Ark

Status of Application: Response to Non-Final

(3) _____

(2) Jay F. Moldovanyi

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 8 March 2006

Time: 4:00pm EST

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of the Non-Final Action mailed 10/25/2005

Claims discussed:

1, 13, 17, 19-21, 23, and 26

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior art of record including Merritt 718,853

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

DARREN W. ARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that in regard to claim 1, that Merritt 718,853 anticipates claim 1 by disclosing a frame with upper wall (top of A), at least two side walls (sides of A), a first opening (large opening adjacent F), a second opening (A'), a striker (B''), a biasing member (B), a set lever (E), a trigger (C), and a floor (F) spaced from the upper wall and extending adjacent the first and second openings (the term adjacent is a relative term, since F extends within the housing, it can be interpreted as extending adjacent the openings). Examiner proposed to further recite that the length of the floor being more than half the distance between the first and second openings to overcome the Merritt patent. Examiner proposed to cancel claim 13 since it is redundant with the step of "positioning a floor plate" of claim 9. Examiner proposed to amend claims 20 and 21 for consistency with regard to the term "first wall" of claim 1. Examiner proposed to amend claim 23 to give antecedent basis for the four posts and properly recite them with regard to "a post" recited in claim 22. Examiner proposed to amend claim 26 to properly recite the floor sections being adjacent each end of the housing where the apertures in the end walls are located. Applicant agreed to the proposed changes. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for details.